

REMARKS

The examiner's enablement rejection is unsound and should be withdrawn.

Whereas it is true that there may be some testing involved with determining precisely which compounds are included within the scope of the claims and which not, such testing would be merely routine in this field. Under such circumstances, case law is clear that there is no lack of enablement. *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731 (Fed.Cir. 1988).

As for guidance as to the structures within the scope of the claims, the specification is replete with the same. See, e.g., pages 8, 19-23, etc. These disclosures detail the determination of donor portions (page 20, second full paragraph), acceptor portions (paragraph bridging pages 20 and 21), linker portions where used (paragraph bridging pages 21 and 22). Guidance as to the involved properties is contained in the paragraph bridging pages 22 and 23. Production of the involved luminophores is routine, as only basic organic chemistry is involved. As the specification states, the approach of this invention to tandem luminophores can be rationally and routinely used to obtain the desired spectral properties. RET is a highly predictable phenomenon" (page 19, first full paragraph).

Giving the extensive nature of the guidance, the plentiful citations to the literature where further information can be found, and the specific examples of the application, it can be seen that the enablement rejection is untenable.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,

/Anthony J. Zelano/
Anthony J. Zelano, Reg. No. 27,969
Attorney for Applicant(s)

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO
& BRANIGAN, P.C.
Arlington Courthouse Plaza 1, Suite 1400
2200 Clarendon Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22201
Telephone: (703) 243-6333
Facsimile: (703) 243-6410

Attorney Docket No.: ART-0001

Date: March 17, 2008
AJZ:hlw K:\Art\1\REPLY 3.17.08.doc